

1
2 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
3 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

4 PATRICK JURDON,

5 Plaintiffs,

6 vs.

7 CITY OF HANFORD; CITY OF HANFORD
8 POLICE DEPARTMENT; PARKER SEVER, in
9 his individual and official capacity; GABRIEL
10 JIMENEZ, in his individual capacity; JAMES
11 LUTZ, in his individual capacity; KARL
12 ANDERSON, in his individual capacity; JAMES
13 EDLUND, in his individual capacity; and Does 1
14 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:23-cv-01695-KES-SKO

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE STIPULATION FOR ENTRY
OF PROTECTIVE ORDER RE:
CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS**

15 **I. INTRODUCTION**

16 On May 21, 2024, the parties filed a request seeking Court approval of their Stipulation
17 and Protective Order. (Doc. 22). The Court has reviewed the proposed stipulated protective
18 order and has determined that, in its current form, it cannot be granted. For the reasons set forth
19 below, the Court DENIES without prejudice the parties' request to approve the stipulated
20 protective order.

22 **II. DISCUSSION**

23 Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(c), any proposed protective order submitted by the parties
24 must contain the following provisions:

- 25 (1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the
26 order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal
27 the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary
of a troubled child);
28 (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of
information proposed to be covered by the order; and

- 1 (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a
2 court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the
3 parties.

4 Local Rule 141.1(c).

5 The parties' order, in its current form, does not satisfy Rule 141. The proposed protective
6 order does not provide a description of the type of information eligible for protection in a way
7 that is sufficient to reveal the nature of the information. (*See, e.g.*, Doc. 22 at 2 (defining
8 confidential information as "information (regardless of how it is generated, stored or maintained)
9 or tangible things in the possession of a Designating Party who believe in good faith that such
10 information qualifies for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).").) At most,
11 the proposed protective order "extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled
12 to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles," though it is unclear what kind of
13 information the parties' are seeking to protect. The parties also fail to identify a "particularized
14 need for protection," and why that "the need for protection should be addressed by a court order,
15 as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties." Without this information, the
16 Court cannot grant the parties' stipulation (Doc. 22), and it will be denied without prejudice. The
17 parties may re-file a revised proposed stipulated protective order that complies with Local Rule
18 141.1(c) and corrects the deficiencies set forth in this order.
19

20 **III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

21 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' request for approval
22 of their stipulated protective order (Doc. 22) is DENIED without prejudice subject to renewal of
23 the request.
24

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.
26

27 Dated: May 23, 2024

28 _____
 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE